

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 12, 13, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as described in paragraph 1 of the Office Action. Claims 2, 3, 5-11, 14 and 16 were objected to, but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1, 17 and 18 are the only independent claims.

The specification has been amended to correct minor typographical errors and to generally place the application in better U.S. form.

The present invention relates to a communication system in which a transmitting station and a receiving station are communicably connected through a transmission path, and the receiving station reserves a bandwidth, which is used in data communication, for the transmitting station in advance.

In accordance with one aspect of the present invention, the receiving station is operable to store a valid period the bandwidth reserved for the transmitting station, and to voluntarily and repeatedly transmit the communication reservation packet to the transmitting station during the stored valid period. In accordance with another aspect of the present invention, the transmitting station is operable to transmit each data packet in response to each communication reservation packet.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 4, 12, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), for the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 is drawn to a communication system comprising a transmitting station and a receiving station. More particularly, the receiving station of claim 1 is required to be operable to, *inter alia*, store “a valid period of the bandwidth reserved for said transmitting station, and **voluntarily and repeatedly**” transmit the **“communication reservation packet to said transmitting station during the stored valid period.”**

Newly added independent claim 17 is drawn to a receiving station comprising, *inter alia*, a bandwidth reserving section, a storing section and a transmitting section. More particularly, the transmitting section of claim 17 is required to be operable to “**voluntarily and repeatedly**” transmit

a "communication reservation packet for informing said transmitting station of the bandwidth reserved by said bandwidth reserving station."

Newly added independent claim 18 is drawn to a transmitting station comprising, *inter alia*, a first transmitting section, a receiving section and a second transmitting section. More particularly, the receiving section of claim 18 is required to be operable to **repeatedly receive** a communication reservation packet including the bandwidth reserved in the receiving station. Further, the second transmitting section of claim 18 is required to be operable to generate a data packet based on generated data **every time** said receiving section receives a communication reservation packet.

It is respectfully submitted that Chan fails to teach the above-identified limitations.

In lines 5 to 9, page 3 of the first Office Action, the Examiner asserts that:

"the MDBS sends shared control feedback information (SCF) in step 4. This information can be interpreted as being part of the 'communication reservation' information because it is control information that informs the mobile end station of the connection situation. Also, no entities are forcing the MDBS to send the SCF status."

The Examiner further asserts that "the MDBS voluntarily and repeatedly sends the SCF."

However, it is submitted that the SCF cannot be interpreted as being part of the communication reservation information because Chan merely describes the SCF as Shared Control Feedback information in line 17 of column 3, and because each SCF is transmitted after each data packet, as shown in FIG. 1.

As mentioned above, the Examiner further asserts that the MDBS voluntarily and repeatedly sends the SCF as part of the communication reservation information. However, it is respectfully submitted that this assertion is also incorrect. In particular, lines 39 to 46 of column 8 of Chan states that:

"the MDBS will send **a response packet to the mobile end system** and inform the mobile end system to go to an assigned packet data traffic channel. **Then, the mobile end system will transmit data packets** on the assigned reverse packet data traffic channel without any packet collision." (Emphasis Added)

In other words, Chan only describes that the MDBS transmits one response packet in order to inform the mobile end system of a channel, which is assigned to the mobile end system by the MDBS, and the mobile end system transmits a plurality of data packets using the assigned channel after receiving the response packet. On the other hand, according to claims 1 and 17, a receiving station voluntarily and repeatedly transmits a communication reservation packet during a valid period, and a transmitting station transmits each data packet in response to each communication reservation packet.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Chan fails to teach: a receiving station operable to store a valid period of the bandwidth reserved for a transmitting station, and voluntarily and repeatedly transmit the communication reservation packet to the transmitting station during the stored valid period, as required in independent claim 1; a transmitting section operable to voluntarily and repeatedly transmit a communication reservation packet for informing a transmitting station of the bandwidth reserved by a bandwidth reserving station, as required in independent claim 17; or a receiving section operable to repeatedly receive a communication reservation packet including the bandwidth reserved in a receiving station, for a second transmitting section operable to generate a data packet based on generated data every time the receiving section receives a communication reservation packet, as required in independent claim 18.

As anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each and every element of the claim be disclosed in a prior art reference, *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Commission*, 808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir. 1986), based on the foregoing, it is clear that Chan does not anticipate claims 1, 17 or 18.

Furthermore, since claims 2-16 are dependent upon claim 1, and therefore include all the limitations thereof, Applicants submit that claims 2-16 additionally are not anticipated by Chan.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-18 are not anticipated by Chan, and urge that the rejection of claim 1, and its dependent claims 2-16, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), be withdrawn.

Having fully and completely responded to the Office Action, Applicants submit that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

Shinichiro OMI et al.

By: 

Thomas D. Robbins
Registration No. 43,369
Attorney for Applicants

TDR/jlg
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 18, 2003